



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,062	06/15/2001	Holger Birk	016790-0422	5177
22428	7590	03/11/2004	EXAMINER	
FOLEY AND LARDNER SUITE 500 3000 K STREET NW WASHINGTON, DC 20007			ROBINSON, MARK A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2872	

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/881,062	Applicant(s) BIRK ET AL.	
	Examiner Mark A. Robinson	Art Unit 2872	<i>pw</i>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 and 28-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18, 28-33 and 36 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/1/03 has been entered.

Claim Objections

2. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: "the optical means" lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kafka 6236779.

Art Unit: 2872

As set forth previously, Kafka discloses a microscope including a laser(12), means or optics for imaging light onto a specimen(18,20), and an optical component(14) which increases the wavelength range of the light to a range including at least two spectral lines which are characteristic of different laser types (e.g. Ti:sapphire, $\text{Al}_x\text{Ga}_{1-x}\text{As}$, $\text{GaAs}_{1-x}\text{P}_x$, and $\text{InGa}_{1-x}\text{As}$ are all types of lasers which include spectral lines in the wavelength range disclosed by Kafka.

Double Patenting

5. Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 7-10, etc. of U.S. Patent No. 6567164, and claims 15,16,18, etc. of U.S. Patent No. 6611643. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the application are merely broader than or are obvious variations of the claims of the patents.

6. Claims 34 and 35 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 5-13 of copending Application No. 09/881049, claims 17-19, etc. of copending Application No. 09/881212, and claims 6,7,11, etc. of copending Application No.

Art Unit: 2872

09/882355. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the claims of the instant application are merely broader than or are obvious variations of the claims of the copending applications.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 1-18, 28-33 and 36 are allowed.

8. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance of these claims: the prior art does not teach or suggest spectrally broadening the light to increase the wavelength range to a substantial portion of the entire visible wavelength range as set forth in the claimed combinations. It should be noted that "a substantial portion of the entire visible wavelength range" is being interpreted in accordance with applicant's remarks of page 8 of the response concerning the specification's support for this limitation.

9. Claim 9 is generic and is allowable. Accordingly, the restriction requirement as to the encompassed species is hereby withdrawn and claims 12 and 14 are no longer withdrawn from

Art Unit: 2872

consideration since these claims depend from or otherwise include each of the limitations of an allowed generic claim.

In view of the above noted withdrawal of the restriction requirement as to the linked species, applicant(s) are advised that if any claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable generic linking claim(s) be presented in a continuation or divisional application, such claims may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Once a restriction requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2319.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Drew Dunn, can be reached at (571) 272-2312. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Art Unit: 2872

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MR

3/4/04


MARK A. ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER